


REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. The Office Communication with a mailing date of July 25, 2007 contained an Examiner's Amendment arising from a telephone interview that the examiner conducted with the applicant on June 29, 2007. Applicant understands that he should confirm in writing the substance of the interview, which was summarized by the examiner in the Office Communication. Accordingly, applicant's formal summary of that interview is attached (the two-page paper entitled "APPLICANT'S SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW CONDUCTED JUNE 29, 2007").
2. Applicant noticed two apparent typographical errors in the Examiner's Amendment. The first was in Examiner's Amendment item No. 7, in which the phrase "the process" should have read "then process". The examiner's meaning for the location of the corresponding amended text was unambiguous, so the instant amended Claim 1 incorporates the amendment that was clearly intended in Examiner's Amendment No. 7. The second apparent typographical error was in Examiner's Amendment item No. 15, in which the phrase "arranged I the descending order" apparently should have read "arranged in the descending order". Therefore, the instant amended Claim 1 incorporates the corrected phrase "arranged in the descending order".
3. Applicant understands that under Rule 312, he may request that amendments be made after the Notice of Allowance, provided that the amendments do not affect the scope of the claims. Therefore, I request that the instant amended claims be accepted by the Patent Office, considering that they are simply a corrected version of the amended claims already made by the examiner in the Office Communication with a mailing date of July 25, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,



David R. Rigney, Inventor

GENETWORKS Inc.
P.O. Box 33296
Austin TX 78764-0296